

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Joint Research and Development Venture Agreement for Industrial Refrigeration

Notice is given that, on July 14, 1995, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Philip W. Winkler, Manager, Cryogenic Refrigerants & Systems of Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture agreement. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., 7201 Hamilton Boulevard, Allentown, PA 18195-1501; and Lewis Energy Systems, Inc., 300 West 1100 North, North Salt Lake, UT 84054, and the general areas of their planned activity are to develop and demonstrate a new form of industrial refrigeration equipment using dry air as the working fluid in a closed cycle at high pressures; an award from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce will partially fund this joint research and development activity.

Constance K. Robinson,
Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.
[FR Doc. 96-5039 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Petroleum Environmental Research Forum Project No. 94-14

Notice is hereby given that, on February 9, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301, *et seq.* ("the Act"), the participants in the Petroleum Environmental Research Forum ("PERF") Project No. 94-14, titled "Cooperative Bioremediation Research Program," have filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and with the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to PERF Project No. 94-14 and (2) the nature and objectives of the research program to be performed in accordance with the Project. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's

provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the current parties participating in PERF Project No. 94-14 are: Exxon Research & Engineering Company, Florham Park, NJ; Marathon Oil Company, Littleton, CO; Amoco Corporation, Chicago, IL; Texaco, Inc., Port Arthur, TX; Phillips Petroleum Company, Houston, TX; and RETEC, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.

The nature and objective of the research program performed in accordance with PERF Project No. 94-14 is to provide planning and response guidelines for the use of solidifiers for upstream/downstream petroleum (on land) operations.

Participation in this project will remain open to interested persons and organizations until issuance of the final project report. The participants intend to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in its membership.

Information about participating in PERF Project No. 94-14 may be obtained by contacting Mr. William Dahl, Exxon Research & Engineering Company, Florham Park, NJ.

Constance K. Robinson,
Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.
[FR Doc. 96-5037 Filed 3-4-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-45]

Gilbert Ross, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

On May 24, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Gilbert Ross, M.D., (Respondent) of Great Neck, New York, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AR5677060, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(5), and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Specifically, the Order to Show Cause alleged in substance that: (1) On November 19, 1992, the Respondent was indicated by a federal grand jury in the Southern District of New York on a 131-count indictment on charges of racketeering (RICO), mail fraud and money laundering arising from the operation of four sham medical clinics in upper Manhattan and the Bronx; (2) on November 10, 1993, after judgment

was entered against the Respondent, following a jury trial, on one count of racketeering (RICO) in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d), one count of conspiracy in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962(c), ten counts of mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1341 and 1342, and one count of money laundering in violation of 18 U.S.C. 982 (a)(1) and (b)(1)(A), he was sentenced to 46 months incarceration followed by three years of supervised release and ordered to make restitution to the State of New York in the amount of \$612,855.00; and (3) on June 10, 1994, the Respondent was notified by the Department of Health and Human Services of his ten-year mandatory exclusion from participation in the Medicare/Medicaid program pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(a), as a result of the above-referenced conviction.

On June 26, 1995, the Respondent, through counsel, filed a timely request for a hearing, and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. On July 28, 1995, Counsel for the Government filed a Motion to Amend Order to Show Cause and for Summary Disposition, alleging, additionally, that on or about July 20, 1995, DEA received notice from the Administrative Review Board for Professional Medical Conduct of the Department of Health for the State of New York (Medical Board), that the Respondent's license to practice medicine in New York had been revoked effective July 24, 1995. The motion was supported by a copy of the Medical Board's Decision and Order.

On August 10, 1995, the Respondent filed a request for an adjournment of this matter, asserting that judicial review of the Medical Board's decision was pending before a State court. Judge Bittner denied that request on August 11, 1995. The Respondent did not subsequently file a response to the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition. Further, the Respondent did not deny that his State license had been revoked.

On August 24, 1995, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Decision, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Ruling, in which she (1) found that the Respondent lacked authorization to practice medicine in New York; (2) found that the Respondent therefore lacked authorization to handle controlled substances in New York; (3) granted the Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, and (4) recommended that the Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration be revoked. Neither party filed exceptions to her decision, and on September 25, 1995, Judge Bittner transmitted her opinion and the record